

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America, ) Case No. CR 3-12-70293 Mag  
 Plaintiff, )  
 v. ) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME  
 ) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT  
 Mario Ochoa-Gonzalez, )  
 Defendant. )

**FILED**

APR 9 2012

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on 4/9, 2012, the Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):

- Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. *See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).*
- The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. *See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).*
- Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).*
- Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).*
- ✓ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).*

*and good cause for excluding time for preliminary hearings under Rule 5.1.*

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 4/9/12

LAUREL BEELER  
 United States Magistrate Judge

STIPULATED: John S. McNamee 4/9/12  
 Attorney for Defendant

M. J. May 4/9/12  
 Assistant United States Attorney